

1674 High St.
Benwood, W. Va.

Friend Pulyan

As yet I have no belief that proof will comefrom you. This ink tells me nothing. Except that ignorance is eager and in it is case authority is the smart alec.

If nothing is to be gained by verbal understanding then let me repeat this is a meaningless heresay.

I will say this....I will give up my pride or whatever it takes to attain the truth. But there must be a method to this madness. You asked for words only to criticize in a manner neither reasonable nor indicative that you even know my attitude. Consequently if I am the mental number that you complain....how little chance is there to understand, intuit or feel your complex gestalts or whims.

Yes, I will TRY to be the supreme court until I find something better to relinquish unto.

Nov 14, 1960

Dear Dick,

Forget about me for the sake of argument for the moment.

Take a Zen Master.

ZEN

Sokatsu Shaku on his seventieth birthday (April 16, 1939) said that in his 40 years teaching 3000 men & women came to study Zen. In the 40 years only 13 completed the training & of these only 4 became teachers in turn.

These 4 were Zuzan Goto, Eisai Yatsuta, Chikudo Ghasama and Sokei-An (who "worked" in New York & founded "The First Zen Institute" which still exists - the Zen Master there now is Miura Rishi).

These 4 men were remarkable men. I know several persons who knew Sokei-An (See "Cat's Yawn", fairly easily obtainable - a reprint of issues of a magazine published by & written by Sokei-An)

As for Chikudo Ghasama (who studied also at Heidelberg) a friend of mine (an "awakened" man) "worked" in Berlin with Ghasama.

PROOF

NOW! What "proof" could any of these Zen Masters give you? What would you accept as "proof"?

If Jesus called on you one day what would you require as "proof"?

If two spies met in the old Nazi Germany (the "Third Reich" of Hitler) & each told the other they were working for the "allies" (US, England etc) what proof could they give one another? All documents would mean nothing

--- HOW could they get together?

→ What proof could anyone give of something that was a personal experience?

After Jesus was supposed to feed 5000 with 5 loaves of bread & 2 small fishes, the religious leaders asked him for a "sign". Wow! What did they want? More? Red, white & blue rays from every pore like Santama?"

It is not a matter of "ignorance" & "authority."

I am imposing nothing on you & expect nothing of you.
But you wrote me & I have no earthly way of knowing

→ what you desire as proof? You never tell me. ←

The "Supreme Court" has established clear rules of evidence
& in law what is admissible & what is not
admissible is clearly codified.

SAY? But you wait to hear ANYTHING WHATEVER
that is said & automatically (& correctly) reply

"myet" (NO!), "Doubt" in you is more than scepticism. It is a "quest".

DONE? Then if you see something done what is that to
you? Is that what you want? Miracles? Wonders? "Signs"?

A little levitation?

One of my letters appearing under your plate
without coming through the mails?

A vision?

WHAT?

→ What would you regard as "proof"?

Please include a stamped addressed envelope.

A mere psychotherapist who talks to you for
5 years (or you to him) may cost \$6,500 or
more. (say \$25 a week). So .04 is still
cheap & I don't get it as revenue. Uncle Sam gets it.

|| If it isn't worth that to you then the
thing for you to do is obvious. But have
the decency to write a pleasant last letter
& say good-bye like a human being.

Friend,

al.

1674 High St.
Benwood, W. Va.
Nov. 20, 1960

Friend Pulyan,

Again you mistake my attitude, either naively or pretentiously for the sake of argument. In the first line of your letter you indicate a desire for argument.

I do not ask for proof. I admit I have said that reasoning is the vanity of the intellect.....but the vanity goes on until something better happens.

Names of sages & saints (name-dropping) rings no bell for me, unless I want to employ reason and hire a detective to run down all that has been written to gather evidence as to whether they ever existed, and whether they actually knew or taught anything worthwhile. And I have neither the time nor the ambition.

Greek words, latin words, or french words, or other glamorous hieroglyphics do not convince me that Truth was conveyed in any of these languages alone, nor that I should rush to embrace something merely because strange quotations give us an escape into the exotic.

I am only trying to feel. And it is lamentable that my feelings should be negatively inspired by your writings.

Let me digress for an instance, that may explain what I am trying to say (which, if you do not understand, precludes to me that there is no use in further bickering).

I just came back from Akron where I went over the weekend to meet with some people. One fellow was a Rosicrucian. To look at he did not inspire. Short, rotund, jolly, and possessed of a sort of paternal conceit about things he had, or thought he had. I had learned in advance that he claimed to have an astral guru, but ~~th~~ I did not know that he was a Rosicrucian.

I have always had a lack of desire for the AMORC group in particular because they seemed absurd and commercialistic. Now he tells me that it was thru them alone that he had found proof of immortality, and proof of reincarnation. I am sitting face to face to him, and I think he is utterly sincere although a bit reticent about exposing things he has been pledged to retain as secret or confidential. I mentioned to him that I thought that he was sincere, but that I next had to ascertain if he knew that he knew or if I could find that he was deluded. He was a scientist of sorts (engineer) and he gave me some good answers. I have been digging for over twenty years and I thought

I had ably sifted at least the rackets from the good-intending. Whatever that is. Here comes a fellow along who is a member of a club that I consider the lowest one on the roster. The one least likely to do anybody any good. And he is sold on it, and I cannot give him a good argument, much less discern by hunch whether he is on the golden road or not.

He claims to know of his previous incarnation...knows who he was. Claims to have the secrets of the Kabbalah, and the masonic esoteric teachings, which he calls detours. I pressed for what amounted to proof of his assertions and he reminded me of your statements when he answered that all I had to do was to join the order and belong as long as he (25 yrs) and he felt sure that I would be as far along as he. He claimed that that which was Real to him was Actuality to him but not to me because my reality differed in proportion to my REALization and my ability for REALization depended upon a certain growth or essence, or chemical change in the inner man. Whatever that is. But whatever it is, if we preclude he is right we start getting an inferiority complex, which is fat for the fire of every or any lesson-peddler.

I also met another man, a successful broker, who was sold on Theosophy. He became alarmed when I laughed at the statement that Master Morya existed. He was utterly convinced that these Masters were available in astral form. But the Rosicrucian said he was on a detour. Yet the Rosicrucian had an astral guru. What goes on here?

Now let us take my underlined propensity for doubting. Should I doubt or accept both of them blindly?

What is it that I should do that is obvious?

Nov. 20 1960

Friend Pulyan,

What would you have me do? I can neither decide nor decide not to decide you know. Is it possible to even write without demonstrating conceit or a pretence at reason?

Sincerely,

Richard

ALFRED R. PULYAN
D.
SOUTH BRITAIN, CONN.

Nov 23, 1960

Dear Richard,

?

Your question is eminently reasonable!
What is to be done if you meet a Zen Master (says the koan)?
Shall you talk to him, ignore him or rock him on the chin?

ANOTHER
ATTITUDE..

Sometimes a student will say: "I give in. I am
through trying to argue. I am at your disposal."

What do we do then? Contact God & have him
send a wheelbarrow to collect the student?

STUDENT
HASTO DO
IT HIMSELF

Alas! Even the saints of old wrestled with themselves
for years in the desert, as did Gautama the "Buddha." But the
student wants supreme satisfaction, ~~enlightenment~~,
health, the equivalent of a \$5000 perched ~~on a~~, --- all for
a casual grudging word and a "might as well, it don't cost
nothing" attitude -----

YOUR ATTITUDE

This however is not yet your position.
You are demonstrating to me graphically that one cannot
"decide or decide not to decide" or "write without demonstrating
conceit or a pretence at reason".

CONVINCED?

That is - you are not saying: I am convinced that
there is something to attain. How do we attain it?

No!

Oh no! You are just making a point.
If you were "convinced" there would be MUCH to say
- in particular how you had changed from the letters before
when you had all your intellectual spines up like a porcupine
& your dichotomizing "reason" all agog to tear everything in half
----- Then we could go on from there.

ILL SHOW HIM!

But your letter is merely a device in the
arguments you put up (valid or not it doesn't matter),
in the pushing away of something you don't especially
want. Better bring on the dancing girls to stir your
jaded appetite, it won't be until the years start
coming alarmingly quickly, perhaps, that you ^{will} awake from
your leaden lethargy.

OK
Please

WHEN WE
ARE
AT HOME"

This is not "blame" of course. No ethics are involved here.

If for some reason the ~~the~~ time is not ripe (& I do not know all the conditions that make one agog for "awakening") then there are satisfactions in life to be had, "unnumbered ways of dream" as the poet says.

HALF AN
FOUR A DAY?
NOT THAT!

And after all how much in any day are most persons actually even "conscious"? Only when it becomes necessary to make a decision! Thus a person could be fully aware & awake from 8-9.03 a.m., 12-12.05 pm, 7-7.05 pm etc ... & could wear a sign "Open for business as follows: ----"

A TEST

Cuspensky says you could be walking down the street & could say to yourself, "I must remember myself". Then you would go on: "I know I see a taxi passing. I know a man & a woman are going by. I see the building across the street. I know ----" and all of a sudden it is three hours later & ~~to find out~~ you are at home (perhaps writing three lines to me) & you say: "My goodness. I forgot to remember myself!"

We are prisoners of our day-dreaming. And so life goes by.....

NOTE
HOWEVER →

[But you will realize this is NOT the "awakening" I refer to. That is not voluntary - even though one "works" toward it.]

I was merely sketching a way of life, the usual one.

BOOK

HE TRIES TO
AVOID
"INTELLECTUALIZING"
AND THEN FLOPS
RIGHT INTO IT!
BUT GET IT.

There is a Mentor book "The Teachings of the Mystics" by Walter T. Stace (MD306, '50) and although he is only a philosopher, & mixes up "mystical experiences" with "awakening", nevertheless it might help to establish the mere existence of that of which I speak & which I claim to know myself & to have assisted others to.

BACK TO THE
PROBLEM ...

I find it quite possible to write to "awakened" friends! It is perhaps necessary to be genuinely "open" & not snide or tricky, but to be just naturally friendly. There is no reason to avoid "reason" especially when it is keen "discrimination". As for "egotism" & "conceit" those are our birthrights - yours & mine, but ONCE, just ONCE and "really truly" they must be shed. After that you can resume - but it won't be quite the same! Friend, Al.

ONE OCCASION
ONLY!

1674 High St.
Benwood, W. Va.
Feb 17, 1961

Friend Fulyan

I think the last letter I got from you was Nov. 23.
I have been thinking about you quite a bit, but it is
difficult to get the muscles moving.

As you stated in possibly the first letter, (assuming
that μ understanding is necessary between two people)
it is necessary for me to arrive at a certain point
before I can understand you.

I do not understand you. ~~yes~~ I can prospect among
your statements and admit that I have no argument for
much that you indicate. It is easy for you or me to
tell another or each other that we do not know anything.
It may be easy to negate in comparison to the construc-
tion of proof or knowledge.

It seems that we are at a sort of impasse. Even if we
are to assume that you know something, my evident failure
to understand you (since the message is not verbalizable)
prevents me from reading your mind or whatever is necessary.

On the other hand if your awareness or awake/ness is
the knowledge of NOTHING, I would have no increase in
becoming nothing just to know it.

It may be that I have not read enough about subud or
Zen (since they seem relative to your work).

I decided to read back through our letters before I wrote
again, and this I have just done. This to try to find
out what is wrong.

All I come out with is a tremendous lethargy. It has
all been said half dozen times.

I have a strong desire to become the truth if knowing
is not possible. I will not overlook with haste anyone
who claims to be able to attain this knowledge or
becoming for me. I will do anything within my power
to achieve, but if I have no ability to decide, what can
I do?

As it looks from it here is up to you and God.

RJ

Thanking you

AUG 24, 1960

"FLEECE BY A CULT" Thanks for the analogy!!

"THEY REDUCED THE ASPIRANT TO WORDLESSNESS BY ATTACKING EVERYTHING HE SAID"

It happened to my teacher but she "happened" to be at the point where this was the decisive factor. Hence ... me! Hence ... your letter to me!!

But suppose the aspirant says (to himself) -- I will go & have lunch and a glass of wine with my girl friend and listen to Saint-Saens Violin Concerto No 3 or Tchaikovsky Piano Concerto No 2 or Scriabin's (only) Piano Concerto or Dvorak's "Four Romantic Pieces" --- or something of Paganini or a later Beethoven quartet?

What is he "saying" in all this? Nothing, only experiencing.

Suppose it was the other way:

"THEY TEMPTED THE ASPIRANT TO UNENDING LOQUACITY BY JUDICIOUS PRAISE AND THE INTRODUCTION OF EXCITING AND CONTROVERSIAL TOPICS."

What was done? What was decided? Who cares now?

I CONCLUDE YOU TO BE EITHER A LIAR OR A WELL-NIGH [⊕] INCOMPREHENSIBLE MAN SINCE YOU DO NOT APPEAR DERANGED (Oh boy! How rude I could get to little Richard! But down kids!)

⊕ The point is of course that you are still using "comprehend" or "understand intellectually". Actually to you I am not "well-nigh" but "completely" incomprehensible & it is this we must face and conquer as it has always been conquered. (Luke 18, 27 "Who then can be saved (metanoia = "changed")?")

ARE THERE ANY WHO BECOME IMMORTAL?

Unclear: All "bodies" decay some day (my self-indulgent friend) & unless you believe Elijah, Enoch, Mary & Jesus "ascended" taking their body with them. ... Does "immortal" mean "last for unending time"? If that is what you mean then your mind (which is responsible for putting a time sequence into events) must survive unendingly. Since I have not (a) contacted any dead relatives or friends (b) lived until the year ∞ AD = "infinity AD" which is a long, long way away yet, it would be unscientific of me to answer you. Maybe in 19,610,000,000,000,000 ... (!) Richard Rose now reduced only to his mind will say to me (in a similar position) "Do you remember our discussions?" except

that he will not say it with his lips, because these have decayed long ago. No doubt you will say - "in all this long time I have pretty well exhausted Richard Rose's repertoire of half-baked scientific facts, pornographic & sadistic imaginings (annoying when the organ has gone the way of all flesh), smart rejoinders, convoluted conjectures, wishful thinking, childhood & baby memories" --- who knows? perhaps one or two loving & altruistic wishes that didn't quite reach action ---

- well, "here I am, Richard Rose, still me, more bored with "me" than ever in 19,609,999,999,999,999,980 years since my death." But still hanging on! still full of fight and only

∞ - 19,609,999,999,999,999,980 years still to go -----

That's a cinch. Soon get to $10^{100,000,000}$ years & then to $10^{10^{10}}$ & so on -----
oo here I come!

SEPT 1, 1960 "Do it just the knowledge of our nothingness?"

Just the opposite.

"What are your plans for the future?"

No plans while Richard Rose is assing about in the preliminary stages with spurts of correspondence ---

When Richard is ready to dip one toe in the ocean I will tell him what to do.

"If you wish I can visit you."

Well I have a nice place here (on 12 acres) but since neither my wife nor I are young we find entertaining a chore except in the case of close, congenial friends - & frankly, right now, you would be a pain in the neck. There is much delight here (there are 3 artists, my wife, my teacher & myself - in 3 houses, 2 close & 1 half a mile away. I can "work" as well by mail as personally (better: so do not need to make this a place of residence for students as I once contemplated. All this is purely friendly & no question of money or gifts ever arises - what we are dealing with transcends such things.

When you are a bit "housebroken" so to say - if ever you get that far & you are only hanging on by your eyebrows now - then you & I can meet and chuckle over the long and bumpy road - sometimes a short road but always bumpy.

SEPT 1, 1960 (cont.)

I am willing to be "friends" but that word means an awful lot. Friends trust one another, would share all they have, would even trust their lives to one another. That is a long way. Right now your approach to me is as follows:

Another cultist?

a liar?

Incomprehensible?

May have to be placated?

Must know a lot more about him.

A guesser.

One who doesn't define God.

Maybe well-meaning.

One who "should" know whether he has had past lives.

One who "should" be able to push Richard Rose over.

One who "should" be meek & good-tempered (confusing me with "religionists") & meekly present my rear-end for Dickie's little boot.

OCT 10, 1960

I PRESUME THAT HE WHO KNOWS
GOD KNOWS EVERYTHING.

When (IF!!) you "work" with me you had better stop "presuming" so much & get scientific. Experience shows that you are wrong. The process is to UNLEARN not to "learn" & finally you finish up "knowing" nothing.

[Of course I "know" as much at least as you having read much, studied at college & elsewhere, and all that. Indeed you may not have had your esthetic side very well developed as I see nothing in your letters but a constant repetition of "how can I know the unknowable?", a little primitive mind-discussion not even deserving to be called psychology & much misconception of a quasi-magical nature about past lives, immortal bodies & what not. Alla podrida.]

OCT 10, 1960

"SHALL I GIVE YOU HONESTY WHILE YOU TOY WITH EVASIVENESS?"


To "toy with evasiveness" implies a degree of conscious deception. Now this might be some technique of "working" & so I might be entitled to it in view of the greater good. However I have not done any such thing & the trouble lies in the fact that there is indeed no way whatever of "conveying" the experience.


A good thing!

Why?

Because anything "explainable" would be liable to counterattack in WORDS & fortunately this is "experience" (as real as a color or a sound) & so standing on its own feet & not verbalizable.

I am NOT "trying to verbalize something".

The meter I would observe  is NOT "degree of understanding or learning" but something between the lines which is my real concern.

Until that goes round  the rule is KEEP TALKING, even recite "Mary had a little lamb" (& in letters "keep writing") since blank sheets of paper are not enough.

My words "housebroken" & so forth are not mere abuse, but if you will observe refer to fundamental changes in a person, maturity, softening up, humanity etc --

Take an underprivileged kid & try to explain why he mustn't spit on the carpet & at first he will say "what the hell does it matter?" Later things may seem different - but so will the kid be.

And if you don't change then look out!
Something there is that plays ROUGH.

OCT 17, 1960

"I WAITED A WHILE TO SEE IF YOU WERE DOING SOMETHING FOR EFFECT (SHOCKS & GIMMICKS AS IN ZEN)".

Such kind cooperation should be appreciated but don't. The surgeon has the advantage of an unconscious patient. I want a natural one, not two beady eyes looking out for "techniques" - which they won't find.

Spilled the coffee on this. Sorry.

Immortality of the beatific vision for .04 says my wife.
WTHOOPS!! WTHOOPS!!

Well, why not? One fellow said "light a fire under me".
So I did. And one day he said "Consciousness sees
itself! It is impossible. Yet it happens."

So I knew. And others one by one came along with
their characteristic phrases.

But if I told Richard all these things he would
have (a) a collection of phrases to flummoodle someone
and (b) a collection of testimonials.

Always there have been NONE.
Always the student was "told" ...
"Follow me."

WHY?

"No reason."

YES.

That's that.

But you can consult the tremendous literature
of the Orient on jivan-muktis in Hinduism,
liberated persons in Buddhism, adepts in classical Daoism,
Masters in Zen & so forth. In Christianity there
was Eckhart & many others. There was Santama, Jesus,
Lao Tse, Bapat Subrah, etc etc. & they knew "something" too.

Is this all the "flimsy" & "nonsensical", "mythological"
side of the race's progress? Did consciousness emerge at a
stage of matter's evolution - & mind too? (Answer this one.)

The musician's seemed to know "something" (some of them)
& some of the poets ---- Why do people SHY AWAY from
this if they merely regard it as trivial? To them it
is not trivial but to be feared (as ego destructive).

UNDATED (huffy) "Yes, I will try to be the Supreme Court"
No comment.

NOV. 20, 1960

Three lines.

"What would you have me do?"

"I can not decide not to decide."

Well then, "not decide not to decide".

(Boils down to eventual "spontaneity", sincerity,
Nothing less will do.)

Just before critical moments in our lives we may be favored either with a clear illumination, what to do or even by a flash of the "real state of affairs" (as I maintain - naturally - not you.)

Abraham Lincoln on April 13, 1865 had a quasi-dream in which he saw that individuality was a mere difference in brain-folds. An identical force was speaking through Grant and Lincoln, Jefferson Davis & Robert E. Lee & old John Brown.

A mighty conscious creative entity, as subtle and all pervasive as electricity, but possessed of every capacity men's souls and minds possessed: an entity which manifested itself through all forms of life. If so why? To what end?

If the law of heredity produced Jeff Davis & Lincoln and a slave trader, did it mean that the force deliberately limited by good or bad or inadequate brain, its own spiritual expression?

By the eternal verities, it looked as if this were true.

It looked as if existence were a stupendously earned game in which the creator had set himself the task of bringing all life to vivid consciousness of its complete identity with him.

And when as the aeons rolled, man became completely conscious that his soul and the creator's were one and the same...
- Lincoln covered his eyes with his hand - - - -

This call heard with his spiritual ear, what was it but the wakening knowledge that he was not Abraham Lincoln - save for the moment of existence. Actually he was one with all life forever. It... did it not mean that that larger segment of himself which dwelt far, far beyond the outposts of human thought, was putting itself in communion with that infinitesimal segment known as

Abraham Lincoln: telling Lincoln that all was well.

... And with an increasing wonder he realized that for the first time since conscious thought began with him, he was not lonely. Never to be lonely again! That which was imprisoned in the poor frame of Abraham Lincoln had envisaged its real identity, had sighted its true home.

Happiness! This, then was happiness! - Its other name was God.

(from "Great Captain", Honoré Merrow)

Next day he was assassinated. But he had told his wife, had told Stanton ...

Is it happiness or a bitter-sweet joy? What words can we choose (The bitterness of maturity, the sweetness of the child.)

Words refer to things we have known. Here is something comparable to an animal becoming a man - what words for such a change?

"Animal becoming a man" says Richard Rose. "How wild can your comparisons get?" let us see.

Experiments have shown that to a certain age animals outstrip human children. But children develop self-consciousness & that is an overwhelming change. Do they learn this; study to do this?

No. Not formally, anyway. But they learn a language & that is a powerful weapon, fashioned by self-conscious people, full of such concepts - even the words "self-conscious". ... Further they observe & copy available adults ... One day the world is seen with new eyes & the child may think it has a unique faculty. This is soon corrected by experience.

It would seem to be easier to take the next step, to Self Consciousness. We have a language skill, we have some feeling of "self". It is true that until it occurs to us we can not know it. But it was the same with self-consciousness, & besides there are a number of people who assure us it happened to them and that it is an "experience" or rather a sudden change in consciousness (like "seeing a joke" perhaps).

But we jib. We say it is a false analogy, there is no such thing, it does not happen. But we cover ourselves by adding, "if something happens it means nothing and is of no importance."

Our friends who are "awakened" say, "since you have little to lose except a few minutes now & then, & everything to gain - truly "Everything" - then isn't it a good gamble?"

But we really fear to go on with this & so we just go on arguing. First we say, what are the techniques? Well in a way the same as for "self-consciousness" i.e. using the language & observation of the guru (who is "adult" compared with you). But there is obviously more than that. We must exceed the "self"-concept, not remove it because it is the essence of a human-being, but we must surrender it so that the Self can come in. This we cannot usually do by ourselves.

Consider the other side of the question!

The guru is willing to give all his time & best efforts to help the student without hope of reward or even thanks. He expects every kind of ingratitude, slippery business, --- and grey hairs. He expects the student to argue, argue indefinitely even though that produces no experiences. He finds the student wants to direct the procedure to some extent, to know all the methods, what is being done & so forth (even if it makes it impossible to help him to realization!). He finds the student is an "Indian-receiver" criticizing every thing in great detail & wanting everything done as comfortably as possible until finally his guru gently takes him in a plush-lined wheelbarrow & dumps him in the Seventh Heaven, which he goggles at with a furred tongue and a lackadaisical eye --- Or perhaps he has a push-button mechanism installed ---

After all with so many advertisers & sects competing for him should he not get a bit choosy?

The guru is sympathetic & not sadistic by nature, indeed he knows what is going on (& alas - what will go on) & so he does his best. But the One stays away ---

"You can fool the guru (perhaps), bully the guru, placate the guru, bamboozle him --- but apparently not the One Self. Oh well, very annoying, try again."

("How does the One penetrate my insincerity?" Not too difficult is it?)

113. Sometimes the student plays a game like those geniuses who cannot look after themselves. So for the sake of their genius a bunch of people (maybe several women) must feed them, clothe them, corral them, get them out of scrapes, look after their health, & so on in face of all discouragements & even in face of blank ignorant ingratitudes. So the student says I disbelieve you and everything but it is your job to save me. So ahead! But there is a catch in this something the student doesn't realize.

FEB 17, 1961

Friend,
Al.

"I will not overlook with haste anyone who claims to be able to attain this knowledge." That's white of you pardner. (But oh what a temptation to say the obvious!

!!! Caution observable !!!
What ever will become of you?
No. Do have attained it.